

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)

Hiriyur Taluk.—

- 1 Gannikanahally
- 2 Anesidri
- 3 Javagondanahalli
- 4 Yelladakere
- 5 Sheshappanahalli
- 6 Hindasakatte
- 7 Aiamangala

- 8 Karthikote
- 9 Bharampura
- 10 Baganadu Vaddanahally
- 11 Upparahalli
- 12 Burujanaroppa

Holalkere Taluk.—

- 1 B. Durga
- 2 Udogere

Average Income and holding of Agriculturist.

Q.—955. Sri G. A. THIMMAPPA GOWDA (Arkalgud).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the average extent of holding of an agriculturist in the State ;

(b) the average income of an agriculturist per year ;

(c) the average income of an agriculturist labourer and factory labourer per year (separately) ;

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—

(a) 6-69 acres.

(b) The gross income of an agriculturist is between Rs. 150 to 800 per annum.

The above figures are based on a rough computation on the information culled out from a variety of sources in the absence of methodical survey and correct statistical data.

(c) It is not possible to furnish information on the average income of an agriculturist labourer and factory labourer per year, as there are skilled and unskilled labourers and among the skilled labour the wages differ for different operatives depending on varying degrees of skill from industry to industry and place to place.

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS

1. Alleged tearing by the Chief Minister of a petition presented by Sri Durga Bovi.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri T. Nagappa has given notice of an adjournment Motion which is as follows :—

“That this House do now adjourn to discuss an urgent matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, namely : When the Chief Minister, Sri K. Hanumanthaiya recently visited Bhadravathi on the 5th April 1954 a petition was presented to him by Sri Durga Bovi representing the grievances of the people of Bovi community whose houses were burnt and who requested for a grant of money as compensation for their loss and this petition was torn by the Chief Minister in public. He has, therefore, failed in his duty as Chief Minister of the State, which this House may stand adjourned to discuss.”

Has the Hon'ble the Chief Minister anything to say in the matter ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—This motion is not admissible. Nor have I received any such complaint. These allegations made are not true. The parties have not approached me with these allegations at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is whether any petition was presented.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—This motion is not admissible and I have not received any allegation to the effect contained in the adjournment motion. I have nothing to add.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble the Chief Minister is requested to say whether such a petition was presented by Sri Durga Bovi or not.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That I have answered. I am not prepared to be cross-examined. I have not received any allegations made in this petition from Sri Durga Bovi or anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Chief Minister satisfied with his answer?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is for me to judge. I cannot take notice of these trivial allegations and allow the time of the House to be wasted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not for you to judge whether the time of the House is wasted or not. It is for the House and the Speaker.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is equally for the House. It is not as though I am speaking in my individual capacity.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Chief Minister is prepared to answer, he may do so, or he may refuse. The question is: there is an adjournment motion wherein it is set out that such a petition was presented and an allegation made that the petition was torn. Whether such a petition was presented and whether that petition was torn or not, if he is pleased, he may answer; otherwise not. So far, there is no satisfactory reply as to whether the petition was presented or not and whether such a thing has taken place or not.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Sagar—Hosangar).—The Chair may ask the mover to say something, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will do it. I know my duty.

(The Chief Minister did not make any further statement.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—So, shall I take it there is no further answer?

Has Sri Nagappa anything to say in the matter?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ (ತರೀಕೆರೆ).—ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ನಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಆ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವಾಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಶೋಚನೀಯನಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪಾಣಿ ಪೇಪರ್‌ನಲ್ಲೂ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿದೆ, ಚೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒದಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You need not go to the merits of the case.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ವ್ಯಸನದಿಂದ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಹ ನಿಮ್ಮ ತರಗತಿಯವರಿಗೆ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is again speaking on merits of the case. The Chief Minister says, he has not received any such allegations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಈಚೆಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳು ಸುಟ್ಟು...

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is enough. I understand you.

The incident is reported to have taken place on the 5th April 1954 whereas the notice of the motion has been given today. As the member has not taken earliest opportunity of tabling the motion, I am inclined to disallow it on that ground.

Apart from this, I would like to mention that after the setting up of a Ministry which is fully responsible to the Legislature and when opportunities are provided in abundance for raising matters of importance on the floor of the House, an adjournment motion has lost its earlier significance. The rarity of adjournment motions in the House of Commons now may be gauged from the fact that the average number of adjournment motions discussed therein is calculated at 1.5 per annum. It is therefore, I may say, necessary that Hon'ble Members should no longer continue to look upon an adjournment motion as a normal device for raising discussion on any important matter as in the past. As Speaker Peel in the House of Commons observed as early as 1894 in a ruling which has become a classic, "what I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency in Home or in Foreign Affairs," the urgency must be of such a character that the matter can brook no delay and should be discussed immediately.

I may add that a short notice question by Sri S. Gopala Gowda on the same subject has been received and I have no doubt that where the question is of importance, the Minister concerned will not refuse his consent to answer the question and if the member is not satisfied with the reply there is an opportunity for raising discussion under rule 39. For these reasons I hold that the motion is not in order.

2. Throwing out of employment temporary Teachers in Mysore District Board High Schools.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is another adjournment motion given notice of by